

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed January 13, 2009.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Final Office Action mailed January 13, 2009, Claims 1-84 were pending and Claims 85-90 were withdrawn. In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-16, 19-44, 47-72 and 75-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Gong (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0064733, hereinafter "Gong"), in view of DeBry (U.S. Patent No. 6, 385,728, hereinafter "DeBry"). Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong and DeBry, as applied to claims 1, 29, and 57 above, and further in of Jhingan et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0186851).

### **II. Summary of Applicants Amendment**

The present Response amends Claims 1, 29 and 57 and cancels Claims 85-90, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-84. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

### **III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Final Office Action mailed January 13, 2009, 1-16, 19-44, 47-72 and 75-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Gong (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0064733, hereinafter "Gong"), in view of DeBry (U.S. Patent No. 6, 385,728, hereinafter "DeBry"). Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong and DeBry, as applied to claims 1, 29, and 57 above, and further in of Jhingan et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0186851).

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

- I. A method for sharing files with remote users, the method comprising:*

*accepting, at a proxy server, a request from a file sharer to share an original version of a file with a remote user, the original version of the file located at a file source inside an internal private network of the file sharer, said private network having a firewall;*

*accessing the file sharer's credentials that enable the proxy server to access the original version of the file at the file source inside said private network;*

*retrieving the original file from a directory on the file source to the proxy server by using said file sharer's credentials;*

*generating a proxy representation for the original version of the file on the proxy server, the proxy representation associated with the remote user and storing location information of the original version of the file on the proxy server, wherein the location information is used to reference the original version of the file in the directory of the file source inside the internal private network;*

*enabling access to the proxy representation for the remote user that resides externally with respect to the internal private network, wherein the remote user is allowed to modify the proxy representation directly on the proxy server;*

*receiving one or more modifications to the proxy representation; and*

*using the file sharer's credentials to update the original version of the file in said directory at the file source inside the internal private network from where the original version of the file was retrieved based on the modifications to the proxy representation received at the proxy server by using the location information.*

As amended, Claim 1 defines sharing an original version of a file inside the file sharer's internal private network with a remote user located outside of that private network. The file sharer's credentials are used by a proxy server to access the original version of the file. By using these file sharer's credentials, the file is retrieved to the proxy server. The proxy server then creates a proxy representation of the original file. This proxy representation also contains location information that is used to reference the original file inside the private network of the file sharer.

Upon sharing the file, a remote user is enabled access to the proxy representation. This is done by allowing the remote user to modify the proxy representation directly on the proxy server. Once the remote user modifies the proxy representation, the proxy server uses the original file sharer's credentials to log into the original file source inside the file sharer's private network and to update the original version of the file based on the modifications received to the proxy.

The Gong reference teaches concurrent version control and information management of files sent as attachments through email. More specifically, an IMS server is described which

keeps track of multiple versions of attachments mailed to multiple users. Thus, when a user sends an attachment, the IMS creates one master copy of the attachment and manages all the check-in, check-out and modification activities by the different users that have access to that attachment (Gong, par. [0009]). In this manner, the IMS keeps track of the many versions of the email attachment that are sent to multiple users.

The DeBry reference teaches the methods for providing will-call certificates for guaranteeing authorization for a printer to retrieve a file directly from a file server upon request from a client. More particularly, DeBry describes a system where a client obtains a “will-call certificate” from a file source and then provides this certificate to a print server. The print server then uses the will-call certificate to print out the file directly from the file source. This way, the client system is able to print out the file without ever actually receiving a copy of the file (DeBry, Abstract).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Gong in combination with DeBry fail to disclose the features of Claim 1, as amended.

Specifically, Gong and DeBry fail to disclose sharing an original version of a file inside the file sharer’s private network by creating a proxy representation and then using the file sharer’s credentials to update the original version of the file in said directory at the file source inside the internal private network from where the original version of the file was retrieved based on the modifications to the proxy representation, as defined in amended Claim 1. Neither reference teaches such functionality.

In the Office Action, it was proposed that Gong taught “*all users having rights to access the attachments will receive email notifications for any version or content update of a file; IMS will manage and log all check-in, checkout and modification activities related to the attachment, and maintain one updated master copy.*” (Office Action, page 3). However, this is different from what is defined in amended Claim 1. These portions of Gong describe that the IMS server maintains a master copy of the attachment which presumably reflects all up-to-date changes done by all the recipients of the email attachment. However, Gong does not describe what happens to the original version of the file that resides in the internal private network of the file sharer, as defined in Claim 1. For example, Gong does not update the changes back to the original file inside the file sharer’s private network based on the modifications to the proxy, as defined in

Claim 1. More importantly, Gong is completely silent regarding the proxy server using the file sharer's credentials to update the original copy, as defined in amended Claim 1.

Similarly, DeBry also fail to disclose the above features. As asserted in the Office Action, DeBry describes that a user sends digital certificate to a digital library and the printer is able to obtain the document from the digital library (Office Action, page 5). However, this is entirely different from amended Claim 1, which defines that the proxy server uses the file sharer's credentials to update the file. DeBry is not concerned with updating the file and is completely silent as to using the file sharer's credentials to update the original version of the file that is inside the private network of the file sharer.

In view of the above comments and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 29 and 57**

Claims 29 and 57, while independently patentable, recite limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to Claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 2-8, 11-16, 19-28, 30-36, 39-44, 47-56, 58-64, 67-72 and 75-84**

Claims 2-8, 11-16, 19-28, 30-36, 39-44, 47-56, 58-64, 67-72 and 75-84 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8, 11-16, 19-28, 30-36, 39-44, 47-56, 58-64, 67-72 and 75-84 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 13, 2009

By: /Justas Geringson/

Justas Geringson

Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Fax: (415) 362-2928